Reply to June 21, 2007 Office Action

## **REMARKS**

This amendment submitted in response to the non-final Office Action dated June 21, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to the points of rejection raised therein.

Claims 22, 23, 25, 30, 31, 33, 36, 39, 40, 45, 46, 47, 49, 54, 55, 57, 60, 63, 64, 69, 70, 71, 73, 78, 79, 81, 86, 87 and 89 have been amended. Claims 1-21, 24, 29, 32, 38, 41, 44, 48, 53, 56, 62, 65, 68, 72, 77, 80, 85, 88 and 93 are cancelled. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 22, 23, 25-28, 30, 31, 33-37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45-47, 49-52, 54, 55, 57-61, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69-71, 73-76, 78, 79, 81-84, 86, 87 and 89-92 will be pending in the present patent application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks offered in response to the Office Action.

## Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1-7 and 9-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory matter. Claims 1-7 and 9-21 are cancelled above.

## Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18-20, 22, 23, 25-27, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 45-47, 49-51, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, 69-71, 73-75, 78, 79, 81-83, 86, 87 and 89-91 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S Patent No. 5,018,069 (hereinafter "Pettigrew) in view of U.S Patent No. 5,727,128 (hereinafter "Morrison").

The Examiner indicated that claims 24, 28, 32, 35, 38, 41, 43, 48, 52, 56, 59, 62, 65, 67, 72, 76, 80, 84, 88 and 92 contained allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application by the Examiner in light of the above amendments and the following remarks offered in response to the Office Action.

Applicants have cancelled claim 24 and amended claim 22 to include the subject matter of original claim 24. Claims 23, 25, 26, 27 and 28 depend directly or indirectly from claim 22. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 22, 23, 25, 26, 27 and 28

Reply to June 21, 2007 Office Action

define allowable subject matter.

Applicants have cancelled claim 32 and amended claim 30 to include the subject matter of original claim 32. Claims 31, 33, 34 and 35 depend directly or indirectly from claim 30. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 30, 31, 33, 34 and 35 define allowable subject matter.

Applicants have cancelled claim 38 and amended claim 36 to include the subject matter of original claim 38. Claim 37 depends from claim 36. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 36 and 37 define allowable subject matter.

Applicants have further amended claim 39. No new matter has been added, and support for the amendment can be found, for example, in page 10, lines 20-21 in the present patent application. Claim 39, particularly as amended, is directed to a method for performing engine baseline modeling of an aircraft engine comprising preprocessing the aircraft engine data into a predetermined format, wherein the preprocessing comprises generating rules for cleaning the preprocessed data. (Italics indicate amended subject matter.) Thus as amended, claim 39 more clearly recites patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 39 defines allowable subject matter.

Applicants have cancelled claim 41 and amended claim 40 to include the subject matter of original claim 41. Claims 42, 43 and 45 depend directly or indirectly from claim 40. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 40, 42, 43 and 45 define allowable subject matter.

Applicants have further amended claim 46. No new matter has been added, and support for the amendment can be found, for example, in page 10, lines 20-21 in the present patent application. Claim 46, particularly as amended, is directed to a computer-readable medium storing computer instructions for instructing a computer system to perform engine baseline modeling comprising preprocessing the engine data into a predetermined format, wherein the preprocessing comprises instructions for cleaning the engine data. (Italics indicate amended subject matter.) Thus as amended, claim 46 more clearly recites patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 46

Reply to June 21, 2007 Office Action

defines allowable subject matter.

Applicants have cancelled claim 48 and amended claim 46 to include the subject matter of original claim 48. Claims 47, 49, 50, 51 and 52 depend directly or indirectly from claim 46. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 46, 47, 49, 50, 51 and 52 define allowable subject matter.

Applicants have cancelled claim 56 and amended claim 54 to include the subject matter of original claim 56. Claims 55, 57, 58, and 59 depend directly or indirectly from claim 54. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 54, 55, 57, 58 and 59 define allowable subject matter.

Applicants have cancelled claim 62 and amended claim 60 to include the subject matter of original claim 62. Claim 61 depends directly or indirectly from claim 60. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 60 and 61 define allowable subject matter.

Applicants have further amended claim 63. No new matter has been added, and support for the amendment can be found, for example, in page 10, lines 20-21 in the present patent application. Claim 63, particularly as amended, is directed to a computer-readable medium storing computer instructions for instructing a computer system to perform engine baseline modeling comprising preprocessing the aircraft engine data into a predetermined format, wherein the preprocessing comprises instructions for cleaning the engine data. (Italics indicate amended subject matter.) Thus as amended, claim 63 more clearly recites patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 63 defines allowable subject matter.

Applicants have cancelled claim 65 and amended claim 64 to include the subject matter of original claim 65. Claims 66, 67 and 69 depend directly or indirectly from claim 64. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 64, 66, 67 and 69 define allowable subject matter.

Applicants have cancelled claim 72 and amended claim 70 to include the subject matter of original claim 72. Claims 71, 73, 74, 75 and 76 depend directly or indirectly from claim 70. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 70, 71, 73, 74, 75 and 76

Reply to June 21, 2007 Office Action

define allowable subject matter.

Applicants have cancelled claim 80 and amended claim 78 to include the subject matter of original claim 80. Claims 79, 81, 82, 83 and 84 depend directly or indirectly from claim 78. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 78, 79, 81, 82, 83 and 84 define allowable subject matter.

Applicants have cancelled claim 88 and amended claim 86 to include the subject matter of original claim 88. Claims 87, 89, 90, 91 and 92 depend directly or indirectly from claim 86. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 86, 87, 89, 90, 91 and 92 define allowable subject matter.

In view of the above amendments, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18-20, 22, 23, 25-27, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 45-47, 49-51, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, 69-71, 73-75, 78, 79, 81-83, 86, 87 and 89-91 under 35 USC 103(a) and submit that all of the pending claims, namely claims 22, 23, 25-28, 30, 31, 33-37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45-47, 49-52, 54, 55, 57-61, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69-71, 73-76, 78, 79, 81-84, 86, 87 and 89-92 are in condition for allowance.

Reply to June 21, 2007 Office Action

**CONCLUSION** 

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully

request allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is needed to place the

application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact

Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Penny A. Clarke/

Penny A. Clarke Reg. No. 46, 627

General Electric Company Building K1, Room 3A72 Niskayuna, New York 12309

October 18, 2007

Telephone: (518) 387-5349